

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)  
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052)  
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7359  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR No. 03-07-70173-JCS
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	STIPULATION AND <del>PROPOSED</del>
CHARKON CHANSAEM,	)	ORDER EXTENDING THE TIME LIMIT
Defendant.	)	FOR THE PRELIMINARY HEARING
	)	AND EXCLUDING TIME

On June 4, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court; requested a continuance for the Preliminary Hearing; and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from June 6, 2007 through July 10, 2007 for effective preparation of counsel. Counsel for the Government and Defendant requested that the Court refer this matter to a Magistrate Judge for a settlement conference to assist in resolution of this case. Further, counsel for the defendant has recently provided the Government with discovery. Counsel for the defendant does not believe it is in his client's best interest for the Court to hold a Preliminary Hearing within 10 days of the Initial Appearance and waives a Hearing within the time provided by Fed. R. Crim. P.

1 Rule 5.1(c). The parties represent that granting of the continuance is necessary for  
2 effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18  
3 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

4 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

5  
6 DATED: June 7, 2007

7 /s/  
8 DENISE MARIE BARTON  
Assistant United States Attorney

9 DATED: June 7, 2007

10 /s/  
11 JOSH COHEN  
Attorney for CHARKON CHANSAEM

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Pursuant to the parties' Stipulation and for the reasons set forth above, IT IS  
14 HEREBY ORDERED that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the  
15 best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be  
16 excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from June 6, 2007 through July 10, 2007  
17 for effective preparation of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant  
18 the requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective  
19 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a  
20 miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

21  
22  
23 DATED: June 13, 2007

24 Bernard Zimmerman  
Honorable Bernard Zimmerman  
United States Magistrate Judge

